Response to Office Action Mailed April 28, 2003

A. Pending Claims

Claims 1-24, 29-48, 53-66, and 71-150 are currently pending. Claims 25-28, 49-52, and 67-70 have been cancelled.

B. The Claims Are Not Obvious Over Pant in View of Tarter Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-24, 29-48, 53-66, and 71-150 as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,012,053 to Pant et al. (hereinafter "Pant") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,550,734 to Tarter et al. (hereinafter "Tarter") under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejections.

In order to reject a claim as obvious, the Examiner has the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. *In re Warner et al.*, 379 F.2d 1011, 154 U.S.P.Q. 173, 177-178 (C.C.P.A. 1967). To establish a *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (C.C.P.A. 1974), MPEP § 2143.03.

The Examiner states:

> As to claim 1, Pant teaches the invention substantially as claimed, the method comprising:
>
> determining a word position of an occurrence of a term in a portion of a document, wherein the portion of the document comprises one or more words [location of a search term in the document, col. 6, lines 35-49, 66 to col. 7, lines 3; col. 11, lines 61-63].
>
> determining a total word count of the portion of the document [total number of all words in the document, col. 11, lines 60-66; col. 7, lines 1-3]; and
>
> determining a relevance value for the occurrence of the term in the portion of the document using the word position of the occurrence and the total word count of the portion of the document [calculate the ratio of the number of instances of a search term in a document to the total number of instances of all

terms in the document is computed, col. 11, lines 60-63; col. 6 lines 66 to col. 7, lines 3].

However, Driscoll does not explicitly teach a help database in a computer-based insurance claims processing system although it has the same functionality of retrieving requested information from a computer retrieval system [see the title and the abstract of Pant]. Tarter teaches a help database in a computer-based insurance claims processing system [Help Desk Subsystem, col. 1, lines 30, fig. 17; col. 20, lines 14-44].

Claim 1 describes a combination of features including:

determining relevance values of terms in a help database in a computer-based insurance claims processing system, the method comprising:
determining a word position of an occurrence of a term in a portion of a document in the help database, wherein the portion of the document comprises one or more words;
determining a total word count of the portion of the document; and
determining a relevance value for the occurrence of the term in the portion of the document using the word position of the occurrence and the total word count of the portion of the document.

Pant appears to teach a method for ranking search results obtained from a database using relevance factors adjusted by a bonus value. For example, Pant states:

The present invention provides a mechanism through which results from a search query are ranked according to user-specified relevance factors to allow the user to control how the search results are presented, e.g., their order. (Pant, column 1, lines 53-56)

In one embodiment, each relevance factor is assigned a base value. These base values and an associated bonus are applied to a set of items retrieved by the search query to obtain a score for each item. (Pant, column 1, line 65 – column 2, line 1)

Pant also appears to teach that a relevance factor is associated with a particular attribute of an item in a database. For example, Pant states:

A relevance factor is a value associated with an attribute which an item in a database may have that either other items in the database might not have to the same degree (where the attribute may have a range of values), or which other items in the database might not have at all (where the attribute is either present or not). For example, whether a document contains a particular word is an attribute of a document. A date associated with a document may be attribute.

> The location of a document in a directory in a file system, the size of a document, and other features may all be attributes. (Pant, column 6, lines 22-32)

Pant teaches of examples of relevance factors. For example, Pant states:

> A few examples of relevance factors and their associated attributes for documents will now be described in more detail. One relevance factor is the location of a search term in the document, or the field that contains the search term. (Pant, column 6, lines 33-36)
>
> Another relevance factor is the position of search terms in the document, called the salience of the search term. (Pant, column 6, lines 50-51)
>
> Another relevance factor is the frequency of occurrence of a search term in the document. The number of times a word appears in a document relative to the number of all words in the document can indicated the relevance of a document. (Pant, column 6, lines 58-61)
>
> Another relevance factor is the frequency of occurrence of a search term in all documents. The number of times a word appears in the collection of documents relative to the total size of that collection affects the relevance of a term to a specific document. (Pant, column 6, line 66 – column 7, line 3)

Pant does not appear to teach or suggest determining a relevance factor for the occurrence of a term based on the combination of the attributes of word position of the occurrence and the total word count of the portion of the document.

The invention of Tarter appears to be directed to a method for providing service providers the capability of receiving payment for insurance claims. Tarter appears to teach a series of databases containing customer information accessible by a help desk operator. For example, Tarter states:

> One embodiment of CHARMS contains a help desk subsystem that provides the means for the operation of a customer services help desk by the System Operator. When the System Operator receives telephone calls or other correspondence from service providers, it resolves the caller's request and/or orders a report to be sent to the service provider, when necessary. See FIG. 17. To help resolve a service provider's request for information, the System Operator has access, through a series of help desk display screens, FIGS. 17A-17P, to a number of databases stored by CHARMS, including the provider and

> payor profile records, the summary file, the bulletin file, and the accumulated transaction file. FIG. 17. (Tarter, column 20, lines 15-27)

Applicant's Specification teaches that the help database includes materials such as medical journals and claims processing manuals. For example, Applicant's Specification states:

> Examples of documents that may be included in the help database for the insurance claims processing system include, but are not limited to: medical journals, textbooks and/or manuals, insurance claims processing manuals or guidebooks, medical glossaries and/or dictionaries, and documents including context sensitive help entries for the insurance claims processing steps, and elements of the steps, in the insurance claims processing system. (Specification, page 3, lines 10-15)

Tarter does not appear to teach or suggest information in a help database as taught by Applicant. Applicant submits that the database taught by Tarter would not be suitable for modifying the method of Pant.

Claim 1 is directed to a combination of features including the features "determining relevance values of terms in a help database in a computer-based insurance claims processing system, the method comprising: determining a word position of an occurrence of a term in a portion of a document in the help database, wherein the portion of the document comprises one or more words; determining a total word count of the portion of the document; and determining a relevance value for the occurrence of the term in the portion of the document using the word position of the occurrence and the total word count of the portion of the document." Applicant submits that at least these features, in combination with the other features of the claim, are not taught or suggested by Pant in view of Tarter. Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection of claim 1 and the claims dependent thereon.

The Examiner states:

> As to claim 2, Pant and Tarter teach the invention substantially as claimed. Pant further teaches that said determining the relevance value for the occurrence comprises dividing the word position by the total word count to produce the relevance value for the occurrence [inherent in the system in order

> to calculate the ratio of the relevance value for the occurrence, see col. 6, lines 66 to col. 7, lines 3; col. 11, lines 60-63].

Claim 2 describes features including: "wherein said determining the relevance value for the occurrence comprises: dividing the word position by the total word count to produce the relevance value for the occurrence." Pant appears to teach the frequency of occurrence as a relevance factor. For example, Pant states:

> Another relevance factor is the frequency of occurrence of a search term in all documents. The number of times a word appears in the collection of documents relative to the total size of that collection affects the relevance of a term to a specific document. (Pant, column 6, line 66 – column 7, line 3)

Pant does not appear to teach or suggest dividing the word *position* by the total word count to obtain a relevance value. Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection of claim 2.

The Examiner states: "As to claim 4, Pant and Tarter teach the invention substantially as claimed. Pant further teaches rounding the relevance value to a number of significant digits [col. 11, lines 25-26; col. 12, lines 41-50]."

Claim 4 describes features including: "rounding the relevance value to a number of significant digits." Applicant submits that the passages of Pant cited by the Examiner appear to teach various calculations but do not appear to teach or suggest rounding of the relevance value. Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection of claim 4.

The Examiner states: "As to claim 5, Pant and Tarter teach the invention substantially as claimed. Pant further teaches storing the determined relevance value for the occurrence in an entry in a table in the database [col. 7, lines 44 to col. 8, lines 10]."

Claim 5 describes features including: "storing the determined relevance value for the occurrence in an entry in a table in the help database." Pant appears to teach storing *default* values of the relevance factors in a database and does not appear to teach or suggest storing *determined* relevance factors in a database. For example, Pant states:

> Default values for the relevance factors used in any particular section may be stored as global variables of the database or the database query engine or the relevance determination module. (Pant, column 7, lines 44-47)

Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection of claim 5.

The Examiner states: "Claims 29-37 are corresponding apparatus claims of claims 1-5, 8, and 9; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale."

Claim 29 describes a combination of features including:

> a computer system including a memory medium;
> a help database for the insurance claims processing system stored in the memory medium, wherein the help database comprises one or more documents related to the processing of insurance claims in the insurance claims processing system and one or more tables configured for use in locating occurrences of terms in the help database;
> program instructions stored in the memory medium and executable within the computer system, wherein the program instructions are executable to:
> determine a word position of an occurrence of a term in a portion of a first document in the help database, wherein the portion of the first document comprises one or more words;
> determine a total word count of the portion of the first document; and
> determine a relevance value for the occurrence of the term in the portion of the first document using the word position of the occurrence and the total word count of the portion of the first document.

Applicant submits, for at least the reasons cited above, that the features of claim 29 are not taught or suggested by Pant in view of Tarter. Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection of claim 29 and the claims dependent thereon.

The Examiner states: "As to claims 53-56, 59, and 60 are corresponding apparatus claims of claims 1-5, 8, and 9; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale."

Claim 53 describes a combination of features including:

determining a word position of an occurrence of a term in a portion of a document in a help database in a computer-based insurance claims processing system, wherein the portion of the document comprises one or more words;
determining a total word count of the portion of the document; and
determining a relevance value for the occurrence of the term in the portion of the document using the word position of the occurrence and the total word count of the portion of the document.

Applicant submits, for at least the reasons cited above, that the features of claim 53 are not taught or suggested by Pant in view of Tarter. Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection of claim 53 and the claims dependent thereon.

The Examiner states:

> As to claims 6 and 58, Pant and Tarter teach the invention substantially as claimed. Pant further teaches that wherein N is the total word count of the portion of the document [total number of all terms in the document, col. 11, lines 60-63] wherein said determining the word position of the occurrence comprises determining the word number of a first word of the term in the one or more words in the portion of the document [number of a search term in a document, col. 11, lines 31-63]; and wherein said determining the relevance value for the occurrence comprises dividing the word position by the total word count to produce the relevance value for the occurrence [the ratio between number of a search term in a document and total number of all terms in the document, col. 11, lines 60-63].

Claims 6 and 57 describe features including: "numbering the one or more words in the portion of the document from N down to 1, wherein N is the total word count of the portion of the document;" "determining the word number of a first word of the term in the one or more words in the portion of the document;" and "dividing the word position by the total word count to produce the relevance value for the occurrence."

Pant appears to teach a frequency of occurrence as a relevance factor. For example, Pant states: "the ratio of the number of instances of a search term in a document to the total number of instances of all terms in a document is computed." (Pant, column 11, lines 61-63) Applicant submits that in the passage cited by the Examiner that Pant does not appear to teach or suggest

determining a word number (position) but appears, instead, to teach a number of occurrences of a word. For example, Pant states: "the weight corresponding to this relevance factor is multiplied by the number of matched terms to produce the bonus." (Pant, column 11, lines 45-47) Pant does not appear to teach or suggest dividing the word position by the total word count to determine a relevance value. Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejections of claims 6 and 57.

The Examiner states:

> As to claims 10 and 38, Pant and Tarter teach the invention substantially as claimed. Pant further teaches determining the relevance value for the occurrence comprises dividing the word position by the total word count to produce a positional relevance value for the occurrence; dividing a number of words in the term by the total word count of the portion to produce a percentage relevance value for the occurrence; and combining the positional relevance value and the percentage relevance value to produce the relevance value for the occurrence [col. 11, lines 60 to col. 12, lines 32].

Claims 10 and 38 describe features including: "dividing [divide] the word position by the total word count to produce a positional relevance value for the occurrence; dividing [divide] a number of words in the term by the total word count of the portion to produce a percentage relevance value for the occurrence; and combining [combine] the positional relevance value and the percentage relevance value to produce the relevance value for the occurrence." Applicant submits, for at least the reasons cited above, that the features of claim 10 and 38 are not taught or suggested by Pant in view of Tarter. Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejections of claims 10 and 38.

The Examiner states:

> As to claims 28 and 70, Pant and Tarter teach the invention substantially as claimed. Pant further teaches that the header comprises N words; wherein the occurrence of the term is at an Xth word in the header, wherein X is from 1 to N, and wherein 1 is a location of a first word in the header; wherein the term comprises T words, wherein T is from 1 to N; wherein said determining the header relevance value for the occurrence if the occurrence is in a header comprises determining a positional relevance value using N and X, wherein the

determined positional relevance value is higher the closer the occurrence is to the beginning of the header [col. 6, lines 36-40].

Claim 28 describes features including: "wherein the header comprises N words; wherein the occurrence of the term is at an Xth word in the header, wherein X is from 1 to N, and wherein 1 is a location of a first word in the header; wherein the term comprises T words, wherein T is from 1 to N; wherein said determining the header relevance value for the occurrence if the occurrence is in a header comprises: determining a positional relevance value using N and X, wherein the determined positional relevance value is higher the closer the occurrence is to the beginning of the header; determining a percentage relevance value using T and N, wherein the percentage relevance value is the percentage of the header occupied by the term; and combining the positional relevance value and the percentage relevance value to produce the header relevance value."

Claim 70 describes features including: "determining that the text section comprises N words; determining that the occurrence of the term is at an Xth word in the header, wherein X is from 1 to N, and wherein 1 is a location of a first word in the header; determining that the term comprises T words, wherein T is from 1 to N; wherein, in said determining the header relevance value for the occurrence if the occurrence is in a header, the program instructions are further computer-executable to implement: determining a positional relevance value using N and X, wherein the determined positional relevance value is higher the closer the occurrence is to the beginning of the header; determining a percentage relevance value using T and N, wherein the percentage relevance value is the percentage of the header occupied by the term; and combining the positional relevance value and the percentage relevance value to produce the header relevance value. "

Pant appears to teach that a document in which the term appears in the title is more relevant than a document in which the term appears in a footnote. For example, Pant states: "For example, if a search term occurs in the title of a document, that document may be more relevant than a document in which the search term appears in a footnote." (Pant, column 6, lines 37-39) Pant does not appear to teach or suggest a header relevance value based on a position of

the term in the header. Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejections of claims 28 and 70.

The Examiner states: "As to claims 11-15, 39-43, 52, 61-66, and 71-150, all limitation of these claims have been addressed in the analysis above, and these claims are rejected on that basis."

Claim 63 describes a combination of features including:

> determining a word position of an occurrence of a term in a portion of a document in a help database in a computer-based insurance claims processing system, wherein the portion of the document comprises one or more words;
> determining a total word count of the portion of the document;
> determining if the portion of the document is a header or a text section; and
> determining a relevance value for the occurrence of the term in the portion of the document using the word position of the occurrence and the total word count of the portion of the document;
> wherein, if the portion of the document is a text section, said determining the relevance value for the occurrence comprises:
> dividing the word position by the total word count to produce the relevance value for the occurrence; and
> wherein, if the portion of the document is a header, said determining the relevance value for the occurrence comprises:
> dividing the word position by the total word count to produce a positional relevance value for the occurrence;
> dividing a number of words in the term by the total word count of the portion to produce a percentage relevance value for the occurrence; and
> combining the positional relevance value and the percentage relevance value to produce the relevance value for the occurrence.

Applicant submits, for at least the reasons cited above, that the features of claim 63 are not taught or suggested by Pant in view of Tarter. Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection of claim 63 and the claims dependent thereon.

Claim 71 describes a combination of features including:

> numbering one or more words in a portion of a document from N down to 1, wherein N is a total word count of the portion of the document;

determining the word number of a first word of a term in the one or more words in the portion of the document; and
dividing the word number of the first word by the total word count to produce a relevance value for the occurrence of the term in the portion of the document.

Applicant submits, for at least the reasons cited above, that the features of claim 71 are not taught or suggested by Pant in view of Tarter. Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection of claim 71 and the claims dependent thereon.

Claim 77 describes a combination of features including:

numbering one or more words in a portion of a document from 1 up to N, wherein N is a total word count of the portion of the document;
determining a word number of a first word of a term in the portion of the document;
subtracting the word number from the total word count to produce a first results;
adding one to the first results to produce a second results; and
dividing the second results by the total word count to produce a relevance value of the term in the portion of the document.

Applicant submits, for at least the reasons cited above, that the features of claim 77 are not taught or suggested by Pant in view of Tarter. Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection of claim 77 and the claims dependent thereon.

Claim 83 describes a combination of features including:

determining a word position of an occurrence of a term in a portion of a document in a help database, wherein the portion of the document comprises one or more words;
determining a total word count of the portion of the document;
dividing the word position by the total word count to produce a positional relevance value for the occurrence;
dividing a number of words in the term by the total word count of the portion to produce a percentage relevance value for the occurrence; and
combining the positional relevance value and the percentage relevance value to produce a relevance value for the occurrence.

Applicant submits, for at least the reasons cited above, that the features of claim 83 are not taught or suggested by Pant in view of Tarter. Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection of claim 83 and the claims dependent thereon.

Claim 89 describes a combination of features including:

> determining a location of one or more occurrences of one or more terms used in one or more documents of a help database of an insurance claims processing system, wherein the one or more documents comprise one or more text sections; and
> determining a text section relevance value of an occurrence of a term using N and X, wherein the text section comprises N words, wherein the occurrence of the term is at an Xth word in the text section, and wherein the text section relevance value is higher the closer the occurrence is to the beginning of the text section.

Applicant submits, for at least the reasons cited above, that the features of claim 89 are not taught or suggested by Pant in view of Tarter. Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection of claim 89 and the claims dependent thereon.

Claim 95 describes a combination of features including:

> determining a location of one or more occurrences of one or more terms used in one or more documents of a help database of an insurance claims processing system, wherein the one or more documents comprise one or more headers;
> determining a positional relevance value of an occurrence of a term in a header using N and X, wherein the header comprises N words, wherein the occurrence of the term is at an Xth word in the header, and wherein the determined positional relevance value is higher the closer the occurrence is to the beginning of the header;
> determining a percentage relevance value of the occurrence of the term in the header using T and N, wherein the term comprises T words, wherein the percentage relevance value is the percentage of the header occupied by the term; and
> combining the positional relevance value and the percentage relevance value to produce the header relevance value.

Applicant submits, for at least the reasons cited above, that the features of claim 95 are not taught or suggested by Pant in view of Tarter. Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection of claim 95 and the claims dependent thereon.

Claim 103 describes a combination of features including:

a computer system including a memory medium;
a help database for the insurance claims processing system stored in the memory medium, wherein the help database comprises one or more documents related to processing of insurance claims in the insurance claims processing system and one or more tables configured for use in locating occurrences of terms in the help database;
program instructions stored in the memory medium and executable within the computer system, wherein the program instructions are executable to:
determine a word position of an occurrence of a term in a portion of a document in the help database, wherein the portion of the document comprises one or more words;
determine a total word count of the portion of the document;
divide the word position by the total word count to produce a positional relevance value for the occurrence;
divide a number of words in the term by the total word count of the portion to produce a percentage relevance value for the occurrence; and
combine the positional relevance value and the percentage relevance value to produce a relevance value for the occurrence.

Applicant submits, for at least the reasons cited above, that the features of claim 103 are not taught or suggested by Pant in view of Tarter. Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection of claim 103 and the claims dependent thereon.

Claim 109 describes a combination of features including:

a computer system including a memory medium;
a help database for the insurance claims processing system stored in the memory medium, wherein the help database comprises one or more documents related to processing of insurance claims in the insurance claims processing system and one or more tables configured for use in locating occurrences of terms in the help database;
program instructions stored in the memory medium and executable within the computer system, wherein the program instructions are executable to:

determine a location of an occurrence of a term used in a text section of one or more documents of a help database of an insurance claims processing system, wherein the one or more documents comprise one or more text sections; and

determine a text section relevance value using N and X, wherein the text section comprises N words, wherein the occurrence of the term is at an Xth word in the text section, and wherein the text section relevance value is higher the closer the occurrence is to the beginning of the text section.

Applicant submits, for at least the reasons cited above, that the features of claim 109 are not taught or suggested by Pant in view of Tarter. Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection of claim 109 and the claims dependent thereon.

Claim 115 describes a combination of features including:

a computer system including a memory medium;

a help database for the insurance claims processing system stored in the memory medium, wherein the help database comprises one or more documents related to processing of insurance claims in the insurance claims processing system and one or more tables configured for use in locating occurrences of terms in the help database;

program instructions stored in the memory medium and executable within the computer system, wherein the program instructions are executable to:

determine a location of one or more occurrences of one or more terms used in a header of one or more documents of a help database of an insurance claims processing system, wherein the one or more documents comprise one or more headers;

determine a positional relevance value using N and X, wherein the header comprises N words, wherein the occurrence of the term is at an Xth word in the header, and wherein the determined positional relevance value is higher the closer the occurrence is to the beginning of the header;

determine a percentage relevance value using T and N, wherein the term comprises T words, wherein the percentage relevance value is a percentage of the header occupied by the term; and

combine the positional relevance value and the percentage relevance value to produce a header relevance value.

Applicant submits, for at least the reasons cited above, that the features of claim 115 are not taught or suggested by Pant in view of Tarter. Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection of claim 115 and the claims dependent thereon.

Claim 121 describes a combination of features including:

numbering one or more words in a portion of a document from N down to 1, wherein N is a total word count of the portion of the document;
determining a word number of a first word of a term in the portion of the document; and
dividing the word number of the first word by the total word count to produce a relevance value for the term in the portion of the document.

Applicant submits, for at least the reasons cited above, that the features of claim 121 are not taught or suggested by Pant in view of Tarter. Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection of claim 121 and the claims dependent thereon.

Claim 126 describes a combination of features including:

numbering one or more words in a portion of a document from 1 up to N, wherein N is a total word count of the portion of the document;
determining a word number of a first word of a term in the portion of the document;
subtracting the word number from the total word count to produce a first results;
adding one to the first results to produce a second results; and
dividing the second results by the total word count to produce a relevance value.

Applicant submits, for at least the reasons cited above, that the features of claim 126 are not taught or suggested by Pant in view of Tarter. Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection of claim 126 and the claims dependent thereon.

Claim 131 describes a combination of features including:

determining a word position of an occurrence of a term in a portion of a document in a help database, wherein the portion of the document comprises one or more words;
determining a total word count of the portion of the document;
dividing the word position by the total word count to produce a positional relevance value for the occurrence;
dividing a number of words in the term by the total word count of the portion to produce a percentage relevance value for the occurrence; and

combining the positional relevance value and the percentage relevance value to produce a relevance value for the occurrence.

Applicant submits, for at least the reasons cited above, that the features of claim 131 are not taught or suggested by Pant in view of Tarter. Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection of claim 131 and the claims dependent thereon.

Claim 138 describes a combination of features including:

determining a location of one or more occurrences of one or more terms used in a text section of one or more documents of a help database of an insurance claims processing system, wherein the one or more documents comprise one or more text sections; and
determining a text section relevance value using N and X, wherein the text section comprises N words, wherein the occurrence of the term is at an Xth word in the text section, and wherein the text section relevance value is higher the closer the occurrence is to the beginning of the text section.

Applicant submits, for at least the reasons cited above, that the features of claim 138 are not taught or suggested by Pant in view of Tarter. Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection of claim 138 and the claims dependent thereon.

Claim 144 describes a combination of features including:

determining a location of one or more occurrences of one or more terms used in a header of one or more documents of a help database of an insurance claims processing system, wherein the one or more documents comprise one or more headers;
determining a positional relevance value using N and X, wherein the header comprises N words, wherein the occurrence of the term is at an Xth word in the header, and wherein the determined positional relevance value is higher the closer the occurrence is to the beginning of the header;
determining a percentage relevance value using T and N, wherein the term comprises T words, wherein the percentage relevance value is the percentage of the header occupied by the term; and
combining the positional relevance value and the percentage relevance value to produce the header relevance value.

Applicant submits, for at least the reasons cited above, that the features of claim 144 are not taught or suggested by Pant in view of Tarter. Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection of claim 144 and the claims dependent thereon.

E. Summary

Based on the above, Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicant believes that no fees are due in association with the filing of this and accompanying documents. If any extension of time is required, Applicant hereby requests the appropriate extension of time. If any fees are required, please charge those fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 50-1505/5053-27800/EBM.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark R. DeLuca
Reg. No. 44,649

Patent Agent for Applicant

MEYERTONS, HOOD, KIVLIN, KOWERT & GOETZEL, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
(512) 853-8800 (voice)
(512) 853-8801 (facsimile)

Date: 7/28/03